

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

Chair: Tony Brockman

Vice-Chair: Tony Hartney

Attendance:

Quorum: 40% of membership

The Constitution states that non-attendance at three consecutive meetings results in disqualification of membership. Apologies for absence should be submitted to the Clerk at jmosarski@googlemail.com or telephone GSTU 0208 4895030

Term of Office: 3 years

School Members		Non-School Members
Head teachers	Governors	
Special Schools [1] * Martin Doyle [Moselle]	<i>Special Schools [1]</i> * Vik Seeborun [The Vale]	(non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1] * Cllr Zena Brabazon
<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Val Buckettt [Pembury House CC]	<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Melian Mansfield [Pembury House Children's Centre]	<i>Professional Association Representative [1]</i> * Tony Brockman [Substitute: Julie Davies] [Haringey Teachers' Panel] <i>Trade Union Representative [1]</i> * Pat Forward [UNISON}
<i>Primary Community [7]</i> * Andrew Wickham [Weston Park] * Maxine Pattison [Ferry Lane] * Chris Witham [Rhodes Ave] * Will Wawn [Bounds Green]	<i>Primary Community [7]</i> * Miriam Ridge [Our Lady of Muswell] Nathan Oparaeché [St Mary's CE Jnr] * Sarah Crowe [Devonshire Hill Primary] * Asher Jacobsberg [Welbourne] Jeffrey Reynaud [Earlham] * Louis Fisher [Earlsmead] * Laura Butterfield [Coldfall]	<i>14-19 Partnership [1]</i> A June Jarrett [Sixth Form Centre] <i>E.Y. Private and Voluntary Sector</i> * Susan Tudor-Hart
<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> * Alex Atherton [Park View] * Tony Hartney [Gladesmore] * Patrick Cozier [Highgate Wood] A Monica Duncan [NPCS]	<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> Janet Barter [Alexandra Park] Vacancy * Imogen Pennell [Highgate Wood] * Sarah Miller [Gladesmores] * Liz Singleton [NPCS]	<i>Faith Schools</i> * Mark Rowland
<i>Academies</i> Paul Sutton [Greig City Academy]	Observers [non-voting] <i>LBH Cabinet Member for Children & YP</i> * Cllr Lorna Reith <i>Learning & Skills Council</i> Ruth Whittaker <i>Haringey (Teaching) Primary Care Trust</i>	Substitute Members at this meeting * Mike Claydon for Monica Duncan * Ewan Scott for Janet Barter * Bill Barker for June Jarrett
		Also present

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

Vacancy

- * Steve Worth, School Funding Manager
- * Neville Murton, Head of Finance CYPS
- A Ian Bailey, Deputy Director CYPS
- * Jan Smosarski, Clerk
- * Peter Lewis, Director CYPS
Kevin Bartle

* indicates attendance A indicates apologies received ^apology received after the meeting

TONY BROCKMAN [CHAIR] IN THE CHAIR

The Clerk must be informed of changes in membership and substitutions prior to the meeting.

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
1.	CHAIR'S WELCOME	
1.1	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked members for agreeing the earlier start time of 3pm. New forum members Liz Singleton, secondary governor [NPCS]; Miriam Ridge, primary governor [Our Lady of Muswell]; and Jeffrey Reynaud, primary governor [Earlham] were welcomed onto the forum.	
2.	MEMBERSHIP	
2.1	There are currently no vacancies on the forum.	
2.2	The Chair reminded members that protocols for election onto the forum have not been received from all groups. Still to submit protocols are Special School Headteachers, Academies, Children's Centres, PVI and Trade Union Representatives.	
2.3	Changes of membership and substitutions must be notified to the clerk prior to the meeting	<u>All</u>
3.	APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS	
	Apologies for absence were received from Ian Bailey	
	Mike Claydon (MC) substituting for Monica Duncan	
	Ewan Scott (ES) substituting for Janet Barter.	
	Bill Barker (BB) substituting for June Jarrett	
4.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no new declarations of interest.	
5.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23RD SEPTEMBER 2010	
	The following change to the minutes was agreed Minute 11.7 to now read '-Susan Tudor- Hart (STH) urged members not to think of the situation in terms of east / west of the borough. The intention was not to take money away from the east, but under the Code of Practice ensure that the right to 15 hours free provision was extended to all children. <u>Historically</u> private providers could look to parents to <u>supplement</u> the government funding they received. This option would not be open to them once the EYSFF was in place and they would be reliant on the funds they received via the LA. The PVI sector is a very wide group including all non-maintained provision – from playgroups to independent nurseries.'	
5.1	AGREED With the agreed change the minutes of the meeting held on	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	11 th November 2010 were agreed and signed as a true record.	
6	MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT ON THIS AGENDA	
6.1	<u>Minute 6.2</u> Susan Tudor-Hart reported that she had heard that the request for an additional PVI representative had been turned down Cllr. Reith (LR) confirmed this was the case. STH asked that this be reconsidered as the additional representation was for a representative for playgroups rather than purely an additional PVI representative. LR agreed to refer the matter back for further consideration.	<u>LR</u>
6.2	<u>Minute 7.5</u> It was agreed that officers would follow up the request for job descriptions to be made available by Steve Davies.	<u>NM/SW</u>
7	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA (EYSFF) – Neville Murton (NM) Steve Worth (SW) – for consultation and views	
7.1	The Chair thanked the EYSFF working party / project board for the extensive and detailed work they had done on behalf of the forum	
7.2	Steve Worth (SW) spoke to the document. He reminded members that the EYSFF was a statutory requirement and that a letter highlighting the particular problems this posed for Haringey had been sent to the Secretary of State. A reply to that and other issues had been received but that answer had not been at all informative.	
7.3	SW further reminded members that the EYSFF was part of a universal provision that every 3 and 4 year olds should have access to 15 hours a week, 38 weeks a year free nursery provision in the setting of the parents choice.	
7.4	In Haringey attempts were being made to focus the majority of the funding to support children from the most deprived backgrounds. Stakeholders had been consulted, and although responses had been disappointing, views had been considered by the working party. As a consequence the decision had been to give a weighting of £0 to Band 1 of the levels of deprivation (the quartile with the lowest levels of deprivation) and redistribute additional funding through hourly rates.	
7.5	Issues relating to the hourly rates have been addressed where possible. The formula also included a flexibility supplement, designed to allow parents maximum opportunity to choose how and where they could take their 15 hours allocation. The maintained sector has some difficulties delivering flexible models and that the greatest flexibility will be found in the PVI sector. Funds have consequently been redirected from the flexibility factor and used to boost the hourly rate. The PVI sector will still have access to flexibility funding.	
7.6	Profit supplement – this funding aimed to compensate those settings where historically supplementary payments from parents were made to cover shortfalls in funding. The majority of this funding has also been moved into the hourly rate.	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	Funding for Nursery schools has also been reviewed to include a lump sum element to reduce the previously significantly high hourly rates. They will also retain funding for planned places for children with SEN.	
7.7	There will be a further review of full time places in Nursery Schools and classes and in Children's Centres. The focus will be on those children with the greatest levels of need.	
7.8	Nursery classes, Maintained Schools will be allowed through regulation to charge for additional childcare provision they provide although it was unclear whether schools were free to set up their own scales of charges or whether there would be statutory guidance on this.	
7.9	The Chair stressed that the working party had worked hard to produce the best outcome for all early years provision that could be achieved in the circumstances. The EYSFF had to be implemented with no additional funding and this was particularly challenging in Haringey.	
7.10	<u>Recommendation 1.1:</u> That the Schools Forum recommends the Early Years Single Funding Formula as set out in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet of Haringey Council AGREED	
7.11	<u>Recommendation 1.2:</u> That the Schools Forum recommends the transitional and payment arrangements set out in Sections 2 and 3 of Appendix 1 to the Cabinet of Haringey Council. AGREED	
7.12	<u>Recommendation 4.3:</u> That the EYSFF is kept under review to ensure it is fit for purpose. AGREED	
7.13	Andrew Wickham (AW) stated that he had been opposed to the EYSFF and had only recently become involved in the working party. He paid tribute to the working party for achieving the best possible outcome given the regulations.	
8	DSG BUDGET STRATEGY 2011-2012 – Neville Murton – for consultation, views and decision	
8.1	NM took members through the report. In funding terms 2011-12 will be a single year rather than part of a three year cycle as schools have been used to previously. To calculate levels of funding the spend plus methodology has been continued. The Forum were disappointed that the hybrid methodology recommended by the ACA working party had not been adopted either for the DSG or, as had been anticipated, for the calculation of the Pupil Premium. The Chair reported that a letter had been written to Lord Hill, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools reiterating our concerns but there has been no response to date.	
8.2	Calculations in the report have been made using 2010-11 data. Actual	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	<p>funding will be based on the outcomes of the Annual School Census (ASC) formerly the PLASC. Members need to be aware that they would be agreeing points of principle today – actual figures will be subject to change once the data collection has taken place. Members were asked to ensure that their schools made prompt returns of the census.</p>	<u>ALL</u>
8.3	<p>A number of specific grants have been subsumed into the DSG . A new Pupil Premium will be introduced outside of the DSG to support disadvantaged pupils. There will be a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) but this has been set at -1.5%..2011-12 funding has been maintained at 2010-11 levels. This will effectively create a potential cut in the region of 3.5% due to the effects of estimated inflation. Schools are expected to manage the reduction through 'efficiency savings.</p>	
8.4	<p>Post 16 funding – there will be consultation on how to fund support for young people through a 'Young Person's Premium. There will be a 1.5% increase in 16-19 funding to manage a 1.4% increase in provision (effectively a cut in real terms to funding) A 3% protection factor is included in the proposals.</p>	
8.5	<p>Music Service – the views of the Forum were sought as to whether the service should be funded from the headroom if the government review of the Standards Grant, which has previously supported this service, is cut. The head of that service could be invited to a future Schools Forum meeting to provide the forum with more information.</p>	
8.6	<p>The estimated value of the DSG has been set at (£204.615m) and is based on 2010-11 pupil numbers which will vary depending on actual pupil numbers collected in the ASC.</p>	
8.7	<p>The entire Pupil Premium must be passed to schools</p>	
8.8	<p>Available resources – schools will from the next financial year receive resources via two main funding streams – the Individual Schools Budget (ISB) and the new Pupil Premium. The Forum will need to consider how to address the treatment of the grant funding subsumed into the DSG.</p> <p>Some grants such as the School Standards Grant, School Standards Grant (personalisation), School Development Grant (excluding Specialist and High Performance) and the London Pay Additional Grant are universal to all schools using a common formula and NM suggested that schools receive this funding as in 2010-11 – thus creating as little turbulence as possible.</p> <p>However where grants are more targeted it cannot be assumed that the schools in receipt of the grants in 2010-11 would be the same school that would have received them in 2011-12. A number of options are available: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to replicate the 2010-11 amount for those schools in receipt of the allocations in 2010-11 (ii) to retain the sum centrally (iii) to prioritise targeted schools in a way which reflects a specifically determined need 	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	(iv) distribute the sum across all schools by a predetermined basis e.g. lump sum, pupil numbers or combination (v) adding the sum to the headroom – Schools Forum could then be consulted on how the money was then allocated. However the MFG will protect the income received in 2010-11	
8.9	There are three grants where a different approach is proposed – the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG), the School Lunch Grant and £522,000 of the Extended Services grants	
8.10	EMAG – it is proposed to replicate the 2010-11 cash amounts to schools and to keep the centrally retained funding.	
8.11	School Lunch Grant (SLG) this is currently allocated to schools where school meal costs are held at LA recommended levels. It is proposed to continue to allocate this grant in the same way.	
8.12	Extended Services funds – it is proposed that the £522,000 be targeted in 2011-12 to provide some transition in support of identified schools to take on those services previously held centrally. In particular it would be used to support Breakfast Clubs and After School Childcare.	
8.13	It is proposed to use any remaining funds in headroom to support the implementation of deprivation funding through the AEN/SEN factors. The amount of money allocated to schools through this factor has increased from 8.21% in 2007-08 to 11.82% in 2010-11. 16% of the ISB was originally proposed to be allocated in this way.	
8.14	Locally proposed formula changes – the following changes to the Haringey Formula need to be considered and if agreed would be a call on headroom. They are: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VI Centre – additional lumps sum (£25,000) • Increase in resourced places within schools and the Inclusive Learning Campuses (ILC) (£470,000) • An additional lump sum on a transitional basis, for expanding schools on split sites (£57,000) 	
8.15	Funds for resourced places are part of a long term strategy to reduce reliance on out of borough placements for pupils with SEN. The money will be used to target new provision and places. There is no general intention to bring children already placed out of borough back into Haringey.	
8.16	Additionally a sum of £450,000 will need to be allocated to opening additional classes to meet rising pupil numbers.	
8.16	Appendix 2 identifies an anticipated £2.7m headroom. Forum members will need to consider how this should be allocated. The report identified two main options: - A general distribution to all pupils through an enhancement to the key Stage Funding Units; or A more targeted approach based on the Forum and the Cabinets priority of enhancing those resources provided via deprivation funding. (i.e. to	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	meet the 16% target)	
8.17	The paper proposed that the available headroom within the ISB would be targeted: - For 3 and 4 year old children through the deprivation supplement within the EYSFF; and For all other age groups of children through the AEN/ Deprivation factor within the Haringey Formula for Financing Schools.	
8.18	The Chair thanked NM for his thorough and clear presentation. AW asked whether a response to the letter from the Secretary of State regarding EYSFF issues and the failure to implement the hybrid methodology for either formula funding or the Pupil Premium ought to be challenged further through the Fair Funding Campaign Group. The Chair offered to write again and to discuss these issues more fully at a future meeting. This was agreed	<u>TB/NM</u>
8.19	Members discussed whether creating headroom by applying the MFG was the right approach. NM explained that he had opted for this method in order that a consistent approach with previous years is followed and to ensure that the Forum made a conscious decision about the level of funding for its priorities. This approach is essential to confirm the implementation of the forum's AEN funding target.	
8.20	Martin Doyle (MD) asked how secure the figure of (£5m) was for the funding of out of borough SEN places and provision. NM explained that he had discussed the issue with Phil DiLeo and that the effect in this budget of increasing in-house provision such as the ILC was to reduce the pressure on this budget over time; there were no plans to bring children settled in out of borough schools back into the borough.	
8.21	Recommendation 1 – This recommendation relates to the Music Service. The Chair explained that the situation regarding the grants for Music was being reviewed by the government and may be reinstated or partially reinstated as had happened to the funding for Sports. The findings of this review were already overdue. However members were being asked to consider whether, if the grants cease or are subsumed into the DSG, the Music Service should be wholly or partly funded from the headroom. Will Wawn (WW) stressed that the primary headteachers were unanimous in wanting to keep the existing provision in Haringey. The Chair suggested that the Head of the Music Service be invited to a future Schools Forum meeting to explain how the provision works. The service currently receives £464,000 in funding.	
8.22	<u>Recommendation 1: The Forum are asked for their views on funding for Music Services in the borough pending the outcome of the government's own review.</u> AGREED : That the service should be wholly or partly funded from headroom as appropriate)	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

8.23	<u>Recommendation 2:</u> The Forum are asked to note the estimated amount of DSG for 2011-12 as £204.615m as detailed in Table 2 NOTED	
8.24	<u>Recommendation 3:</u> The Forum are asked to endorse the approach, for those universal grants subsumed into the DSG, outlined at paragraph 4.9 of the report which allows for the replication of 2010-11 cash amounts taking account of a 1.5% reduction in line with the MFG rate. ENDORSED	
8.25	Recommendation 4 – Targeted grants. Tony Hartney (TH) stated that some of these grants are only available to Haringey because of the hard work and dedication of specific schools. He asked how such schools would have the money they had won via these grants protected. NM replied that the funds (-1.5% from the MFG) would be protected in 2011-12 but there were no assurances for future years. It was agreed that the phrase ' this situation to be reviewed in future years ' be added to Recommendation 4	
8.26	<u>Recommendation 4 –</u> The Forum is asked to endorse the approach, for those targeted grants subsumed into the DSG, outlined at paragraph 4.14 of the report which adds those resources to the available headroom – recognising that the MFG will seek to protect 2010-11 amounts and thus limiting the value of resource actually transferred to headroom – this situation to be reviewed in future years. ENDORSED	
8.27	Recommendation 5 – EMAG resources Alex Atherton (AA) asked for clarification as to why it was being proposed to retain some funding centrally. NM explained that the proposal was to fund a central service available to all schools and this would be part of the structure that would be announced on the 18 th January.	
8.28	<u>Recommendation 5 –</u>The Forum is asked to endorse the distribution of EMAG resources on the basis of 2010-11 cash amounts to schools and for the retention of £628,000 centrally in support of narrowing the achievement gap for underperforming ethnic groups in schools as described in paragraph 4.19 of the report. ENDORSED	
8.29	<u>Recommendation 6 –</u> the Forum is asked to endorse the use of 2010-11 formula for distributing the resources from the previous School Lunch Grant, as described in paragraph 4.20 of the report ENDORSED	
8.30	<u>Recommendation 7-</u> The Forum is asked to endorse the targeting of £522,000 of resources in 2011-12 only, as described in paragraph 4.25, to allow the schools specified in Appendix 4 to adopt	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	wraparound childcare services previously provided through centrally retained services. ENDORSED	
8.31	<u>Recommendation 8</u> – the Forum is asked to endorse the proposed local formula changes described in paragraph 5.4 including providing the resource necessary to support them as the first priority from the available headroom ENDORSED	
8.32	Recommendation 9 – the allocation of available funds from headroom being allocated through the deprivation measures within the EYSFF and through the Haringey Schools Funding Formula according to pupil age.	
8.33	AW spoke on behalf of primary headteachers. In order to fund the EYSFF an additional £500,000 was needed to meet the increased allocation to the PVI sector. This could either be taken from the school budget shares of those primary and nursery schools with 3 and 4 year old provision or could alternatively be top sliced from the available headroom to all schools. He further proposed that for this year only the remaining headroom be allocated to absorb the 1.5% cut in respect of the MFG. Mike Claydon (MC) stated that this effectively meant that an additional £500,000 would go into Nursery Education. The Chair stated that the counter argument to AW's proposal would be that Haringey already spent more money on early years than notionally received from the government (on the basis of updated hypothecation of the former SSA blocks) . Susan Tudor-Hart stressed that the money would be used to properly fund the EYSFF not just the PVI sector. AW added that there had been no new money for the EYSFF – the intention had been for it to be cost neutral, however the situation in Haringey was possibly unique and the costs of implementation could not be cost neutral.	
8.34	The motion that the additional resources needed to fund the EYSFF, after implementing the transitional funding arrangement provisionally agreed, should be top sliced from the headroom was put to the vote. Votes for 13 Votes against 11 Abstentions 3 The motion was carried	
8.35	Members discussed how the remaining headroom should be allocated. AA spoke in favour of the method proposed in the report to allocate this via the various deprivation factors. He pointed out that 16% of the DSG was allocated by government for this purpose and in 2007-08 the forum had agreed to aim to allocate the whole of this 16% via deprivation AEN/ SEN factors. This was to be phased in to ensure that schools that would lose funds as a result of this decision would not suddenly face big cuts. However by 2010-11 only 11.8% was actually being allocated in this way. AW reported that primary heads were aware of these issues but had voted unanimously at their meeting to increase the MFG share which would benefit all schools rather than allocate the money through the	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
MONDAY 17TH JANUARY 2011**

	AEN deprivation factors which would benefit some but not all schools.	
8.36	AW's amendment to allocate remaining headroom to reduce the 1.5% cut to school budgets was put to the vote Votes for 6 Votes against 7 Abstentions 6 The motion was lost	
8.37	<u>Recommendation 9</u> – The Forum is asked to endorse routing the remaining available headroom within the ISB through deprivation measures within the EYSFF and the Haringey Schools Funding Formula according to the relevant pupils' age Votes for 16 Votes against 0 Abstentions 3 The recommendation was endorsed	
8.38	<u>Recommendation 10</u> –The Forum approves that a sum of £300,000 in respect of SEN transport costs be charged against the DSG funded from savings and efficiencies to be found in the centrally retained element of the DSG Votes for 26 Votes against 0 Abstentions 0 The recommendation was AGREED	
15	DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING The next meeting is proposed as being <u>17th February 2011</u> 3.45 for 4p.m. This date to be confirmed	
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.	

The meeting closed at 5.35 pm

TONY BROCKMAN

Chair